DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 320 671 PS 018 855

AUTHOR Marx, Fern
TITLE School Age Child Care in America: Final Report of a National Provider Survey. Working Paper No. 204.
INSTITUTION Wellesley Coll., Mass. Center for Research on Women.
SPONS AGENCY Smith Richardson Foundation, Inc., Greensboro, N.C.
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 53p.
AVAILABLE FROM Wellesley College Center for Research on Women, Wellesley, MA 02181 ($6.00).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Accreditation (Institutions); *Educational Quality; National Surveys; *Parent Participation; Program Evaluation; *Program Improvement; *School Age Day Care; Technical Assistance; *Work Environment
IDENTIFIERS *Monitoring; *Program Characteristics

ABSTRACT

This report presents findings of a national survey of school-age child care in the United States which yielded responses from 130 providers in 13 states. The 71-item survey instrument was used to gather information on such program characteristics as the number of children in the program, the program's location, the type of facility in which the program was housed, and days and hours of operation. In addition, a series of questions examined the types of work environment in the programs in terms of staff salaries and benefits. Issues of program quality were addressed through questions regarding staff education, experience, and training; staff-to-child ratios; and types of activities and curriculum offered. Parent participation was also investigated. In general, findings indicated that programs appeared to offer a solid assortment of choices designed to help children relax and expand their horizons in a supervised environment. Although staff turnover was a major concern, openings seemed to be filled in 5 to 6 weeks. The teaching staff appeared to be moderately well-educated. Sufficient in-service training opportunities for improving staff skills were available. Salaries in programs run by public schools were among the highest. Average staff-child ratios for 6- and 7-year-olds were comparatively high. (RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED320671

SCHOOL AGE CHILD CARE IN AMERICA:

FINAL REPORT OF A NATIONAL PROVIDER SURVEY

Fern Marx

1990

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Fern Marx

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

This study was made possible by a grant from the Smith-Richardson Foundation

PS 018853

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

WORKING PAPER
NO. 204

Wellesley College
Center for Research on Women
Wellesley, MA 02181

Working Papers added to the Center Series in the Spring of 1990 are dedicated, with gratitude and affection, to the memory of

Janet W. Shaw

Publications Assistant at the Center from 1980-89

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to acknowledge the substantive contribution of the following Wellesley College students to the work of the project and the final report: Sylvia Temperley guided the development of the computer programs to analyze the data and supervised the coding and data entry of the questionnaires. In addition, she analyzed several of the open-ended questions and developed first drafts of the responses. Mary Flynn helped with the development of the code book and a data entry program. Kate Nolan, Jennifer Tingley and Betty Smith all provided valuable assistance in coding the surveys. Thanks are due to Dale Fink, Research Associate at the Wellesley College Center for Research on Women, for participating in the development of the sampling methodology, selecting the sample, conducting the survey, and providing detailed information on the survey methodology. Thanks are also due to the 130 programs which responded to the survey.

The author also wishes to take this opportunity to acknowledge the work of the School-Age Child Care Project at Wellesley College Center for Research on Women under the direction of Michelle Seligson. Since 1979, the Project has provided leadership, expertise and technical assistance to an emerging field. Without the work of the SACC Project, many of the programs in this survey would not have been established.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Background	1
Introduction	5
Findings	7
Program Characteristics	8
Quality of Staff	17
Adult Staff Environments	20
Quality of Program	28
Technical Assistance, Monitoring, Evaluations, and Accreditation	39
Things Programs Are Most Proud Of	40
Things Programs Would Like Most to Change	41
Conclusions	42
Appendix	44
References	47

LIST OF TABLES

1: Types of Records 12
2: Enrollment 14
3: Eligibility Criteria 15
4: Advertising Sources 16
5: Additional Services Requested 16
6: Minimum Level of Education 18
7: Minimum Certification Requirements 19
8: Weeks, Hours, and Wages 21
9: Average Salary 22
10: Average Hourly Wage for Teachers 23
11: Staff Benefits 24
12: Staff Training 25
13: Staff Meetings 26
14: Staff-Child Ratios 27
15: Staff-Child Ratios for 6 & 7 year olds by Program Affiliation 28
16: Parent Participation 29
17: Additional Space used by Program 31
18: Program Activities 33
19: Additional Activities 35
20: Special Needs Served 35
21: Average Fees by Program Auspice 36
22: Average Fees by State 37
23: Activities Requiring Additional Fees 37
24: Scholarship Sources 38
25: Funding Sources for Annual Operating Budgets 38

A-I: Comparison by Program Auspices/Affiliation 44
A-II: Comparison by State/Region 45
A-III: Comparison by Type of Location 46

SCHOOL AGE CHILD CARE (SACC) IN AMERICA: A NATIONAL PROVIDER SURVEY

BACKGROUND

The history of school age child care in the United States indicates that it is not a new issue, rather we have been grappling with the problem for at least 100 years. The care of school age children has assumed increased importance at times of national crisis (e.g., the Depression and World War II), when the country absorbs large numbers of new immigrants, and in periods when women enter the labor force in increasing numbers. As the nation became increasingly urbanized and traditional forms of child care by kin became less available, day nurseries (the early child care center) extended their programs to include school age children. These programs not only provided the care needed to permit parents to work, but often had a mission: helping the immigrant child assimilate or caring for those from very poor or otherwise unsuitable homes (Seligson et al, 1983).

Another form of school-age child care developed during the late 1800s and the early years of the 20th Century, in response to the needs cited above and the fact that in many urban settings unattended youngsters often congregated in the streets with little to occupy themselves. While concern was voiced for the well-being of these "latchkey children", greater attention was paid to the possibility that these youngsters would engage in delinquent behavior. Settlement houses and other organizations began developing specific programs for school age children and young adolescents; organized playgrounds came into being, as did many of the traditional youth serving organizations including Boys and Girls Clubs, Scouts, and the 4-H.

Between the end of World War II and the early 1970s although increasing numbers of mothers entered the labor force, little attention was paid to the need for child care, especially care for the school age child. A mother at home when children returned from school became less and less characteristic of American families. By the early 1970s, the "latchkey" problem was once again being discussed in the public arena. Articles in newspapers and magazines raised public consciousness of the potential harm to children left on their own. By the mid-1970s, new school age child care programs began to spring up across the country, many modeled on the programs developed in Brookline, Massachusetts which were run by parent boards in public school space. Municipalities, particularly departments of parks and recreation, public schools, youth serving agencies including YMCA and YWCA, Campfire, and Boys and Girls Clubs, and traditional child care programs became increasingly involved in providing organized after school care programs. By the mid-1980s, the federal government through the Dependent Care Block Grant began providing limited program start-up funds and by the end of the decade approximately 15 states had legislated some support for school age child care program development.

The early 1980s also marked a turning point in the research community's interest in the perils of self-care. A small number of studies began to offer evidence that children routinely left in self-care did less well on a number of developmental, academic and behavioral measures than children in adult care. Important differences were noted by the setting in which the self care takes place. Only a small number of studies were conducted on children attending after school care programs, and findings from these studies offer a limited view of the potential of what a "quality" program can achieve. The weakness of much of the research completed to date is that few studies have followed children over time to measure the impact of self-care or programs and even fewer have robust designs (random assignment or other methods to construct comparison groups) which would permit the generalization of study findings.

Before we can begin to measure the impact of school-age child care programs on the children who use them, we need to understand where these programs are and how they work. More importantly do they work? What obstacles do they face in getting started and in their daily operations? Are there differences between programs under different auspices such as the public schools and community child care centers? What is a "quality" school age child care program and how can we improve that quality? Who staffs school age child care programs and what type of training would best prepare them to provide high levels of care? These are just a few of the questions which are currently being asked about a field which continues to develop rapidly. While experientially we know what high quality programs look like, how to train staff to provide such care, and how to program successfully we still need answers to the above questions if we are to improve the quality of care offered. Such questions also will help us understand the implications of the organization of services for the quality of the program and begin to provide the information necessary for measuring the impact of different types of programs on the children served.

The SACC in America Provider Survey, which is the subject of this report, was part of a year long investigation on the supply and quality of center based school age child care in the United States. State licensing agencies and departments of education were surveyed regarding the numbers of programs and children served and the standards and regulations applied to these programs. To answer questions about the quality of care being provided, a detailed survey of 130 programs from 13 states was conducted. A new national study currently underway, funded by the Federal Department of Education, should provide even more definitive information on the issues of the supply and quality of school age child care in the United States. The results of the study will be based on telephone interviews with a representative sample of 1,300 school age child care programs across the country as well as in-depth site visits to 18 programs.

Prior Studies

There have been few published surveys of school age child care programs. In 1982, the Montgomery County (Maryland) Commission on Children and Youth commissioned a study of child care needs and resources including those for school age children. Results published in 1984 identified the number of programs providing

school-age child care, the number of children served and some of the problems faced by these programs in terms of facilities and transportation. (Montgomery County Commission on Children and Youth, 1984.)

The Association for Children of New Jersey conducted a small survey in 1985 on school age child care programs run by local Boards of Education and by community agencies such as the YW or YMCA (Association for Children of New Jersey, 1985). The findings from these 17 programs are remarkably similar to the data resulting from our study (SACC in America provider survey). Most programs in this survey were self-supporting through parent fees. Outside funding received from United Ways or local boards of education was used primarily for start-up costs. The costs to parents averaged only $80 per month but few programs had sliding fee scales and most programs could not meet the needs of lower income families. In keeping with the findings reported below, none of the programs appeared to be an extension of the school day. Rather, all stressed recreation, quiet time and group and individual play.

A survey of school districts in the state of Washington to measure the extent and type of school district involvement in the provision of school age child care was conducted in 1986 (Campbell, 1988). The survey covered all of the areas included in the SACC in America provider survey but out of 512 surveys mailed only 37 districts responded with information on their school age child care programs. Site supervisors (program directors) salaries averaged $6.25 per hour, site staff salaries (teachers) were around $4.75 per hour. Not unexpectedly, staff turnover was high. Parental involvement was generally very important in starting programs but the survey found that parents were "minimally involved" in determining program content, policy or staffing. Program activities were very similar to those in the New Jersey study and the SACC in America provider survey.

Two surveys of school district involvement with SACC have been conducted in Florida; the first in 1984 (Florida House of Representatives, 1985); and the second in 1987 (Fearnside and Cantrell, 1988). A third school age child care survey of all school districts and all elementary schools is currently underway. In the first survey of 67 school districts, 239 schools in 19 districts reported some involvement in school age child care; a total of 21,736 students were served. The programs were primarily clustered in the densely populated areas of the state. As in the SACC in America Provider Survey, there were several program models. The first program model is SACC run by the individual schools through the community education program; the second is the use of school facilities under contract with a local children's service agency, including the YMCA, Latchkey, Inc, a non-profit school age child care agency, and a county Title XX agency; the third model is a mixed system of models one and two, with some schools in the district providing programs directly, others contracting for services.

The programs provide both structured and unstructured activities; some provide time and space for doing homework. The schools report about as many older children (third to fifth graders) involved in the program as younger children (kindergarten to second grade). Only 3% of the SACC program staff work full time or all day in the programs; 9% of the staff are teachers with Florida certification. All districts require

the SACC programs to be self-supporting and reported no extra costs to the district incurred by providing the service. Eight of the 19 districts report using a sliding fee scale based on family income. Title XX, United Way, county funds, private foundations and individuals provide scholarship support. Based on data from 6 districts, weekly fees ranged from a low of $8.00 to a high of $22.00; the average fee was $13.25 a week for after school, care or just over half (54%) of the average fee found in the SACC in America survey for Florida programs ($24.50 per week). Eighty percent of survey respondents projected an increased need services and 75% of the established programs had plans for expansion.

In response to the unmet need found in the 1984 survey, the state established the School-Age Child Care Incentives Program in 1986, which provides incentives to school districts and other public and private agencies for the establishment of SACC programs. The second survey conducted in 1987 was designed to provide the Department of Education with data on which to base recommendations to the legislatures on the feasibility, desirability and cost of implementing the SACC program on a statewide basis. The 1987 survey found that the number of districts involved in SACC had nearly doubled in 3 years (34 versus 19 districts); as had the number of schools involved (500 versus 239). The number of students served in 1987 increased to 33,000. Nineteen districts reported running before school programs but only 12 to 13 districts provided summer care or holiday coverage.

As in the SACC in America Survey, homework help, art, crafts, sports, and games were the most frequently reported activities offered by the programs. Two thirds of the programs provide tutoring as compared to 25% of the programs in the SACC in America survey. The staff child ratios reported ranged from 1:8 to 1:25. Ratios ranged from 1:15 in medium sized districts to 1:18 in large districts. This average is higher than the SACC in America's Florida average of 1:14.2, suggesting that the volunteer respondents to the later survey probably represent somewhat higher quality programs than is true for the state as a whole.

In 1988, the Community Service Society of New York City funded the Wellesley College School-Age Child Care Project to conduct a study of school age child care resources in New York City (Seligson, Marx & Feldman, 1989). A total of 379 programs were included in the survey sample, but there were only 44 responses representing 59 programs for a response rate of 17%. As in the surveys cited above, the findings are based on a small sample and the extent to which these findings are representative of all programs in New York City remains unknown. Nonetheless, the survey data did yield important findings such as the extent of unmet need as shown by the length of program waiting lists; the need for programs to increase the length of their program year and the number of days per week they operate to more fully meet the needs of working parents; and the constraints that program auspices or funding sources place on program development. Contrary to the findings of the SACC in America survey, in the New York City survey programs with the best staff child ratios paid the lowest salaries. There was little variance in education requirements for teachers across funding sources rather the differences in salary seemed to be explained by affiliation with certain delivery systems and in some instances the power derived from union membership.

Overview of the SACC in America Provider Survey

The findings of the SACC in America survey are generally consistent with those in the small surveys cited above. In general, programs responding to the survey appear to be offering a solid assortment of choices designed to help children relax and expand their horizons in a supervised environment. Staff turnover, a major concern in the State of Washington survey, the New York City survey, and in the National Child Care Staffing Study (Whitebook, Howes & Phillips, 1989), is also a concern in the current study but openings do appear to be filled within five to six weeks. The teaching staff appear to be moderately well educated and sufficient in-service training opportunities are available to help improve staff skills. As in the New York City survey teacher salaries in public school-run programs are among the highest paid but the average staff child ratios for 6 and 7 year olds in the SACC in America survey are almost one-third higher than those in the New York survey (1:13 and 1:30 respectively).

On the whole, the findings of the SACC in America survey are somewhat reassuring. While exploratory in nature, this study does provide answers to some of our questions on the shape of after school care programs and some of the attributes of quality care. By 1992, when the federally supported survey is completed we should have sufficient information on school age child care programs to begin work on the next major research question.....the impact of these programs on the children and families that use them.

INTRODUCTION

The following report is based on responses from 130 school-age child care providers in 13 different states in the United States. The survey was conducted in the fall of 1988 through the solicitation of 250 school-age child care providers. Participation in the survey was voluntary. The survey was designed to be representative of the various types of administrative auspices and organizational arrangements characteristic of the current providers of school-age child care across the country.

Programs were eligible for inclusion in the survey if, at a minimum, they served children before and/or after school between the ages of 5 and 12 years old and services were available starting no later than age 8. Programs were required to met for a minimum of three days per week, two hours per day during the school year. While programs were asked for a limited amount of information on all sites they operated, the majority of the information requested was to be reported for only one site. In many instances, this proved to be a difficult request to honor and the information obtained had to be disaggregated.

Selecting the Sample

To obtain the lists of school-age child care programs to include in the survey it was determined through the supply survey that neither state child care licensing agencies

nor state departments of education had the capacity to supply this type of information. State child care licensing agencies did not have the capacity to separate school-age programs from other licensed child care centers. In addition, their lists would not include school district programs, which are exempt from licensing in all but 10 states. Few state departments of education appeared to know which local districts had school-age child care programs.

The most comprehensive lists of school-age child care programs available were those maintained by School Age Notes, the only nationally circulated publication oriented exclusively to providers of school-age child care. While we were aware that programs subscribing to the publication might represent those with a greater commitment to quality and staff development, the lack of any other national lists, the exploratory nature of the survey and the length of the instrument (approximately one to two hours) dictated the decision to use this list.

Six different areas of the country, encompassing 13 states, were selected to account for differing types of organizational development as well as to acknowledge geographical differences in program auspices. For example, it was known that in Minnesota school-age child care was primarily run by public schools through community education. To balance the unique development of school-age programs in Minnesota, Illinois which provided programs under a variety of auspices was also included in the midwestern region.

To determine how many providers would volunteer to take part in the survey, 100 letters were mailed to randomly selected New Jersey programs from the program list. Programs interested in participating were asked to return an enclosed postcard; 35% of the programs responded. To obtain the additional programs to include in the sample, 150 letters were mailed to randomly selected providers from the list in 12 additional states. The design called for approximately 50 volunteers in each area from which 35 would be randomly selected to receive the survey. It was anticipated that 25 programs in each area would complete the survey. However, few of the additional areas responded at the anticipated rate and the final list included 185 programs; 130 programs returned the completed questionnaire.

The Survey Instrument

The 18 page, 71 question survey instrument was based on the instrument developed and field tested for a study of available resources for school-age children in New York City, "When School is Out In New York City" (Seligson, Marx & Feldman 1989). This study was conducted by the Wellesley College Center for Research on Women's School-Age Child Care Project for the New York City School Age Child Care Committee and commissioned by the Community Service Society of New York City.

The SACC in America survey instrument (modified by the addition of several questions) gathered basic descriptive information on the programs including the number of children attending the program, the location of the program, the type of facility in which the program was housed, the days and hours of operation, etc. In addition, a

series of questions examined the types of work environment found in the programs in terms of staff salaries, benefits. Issues of program quality were touched on through questions regarding staff education, experience, training, staff:child ratios and the types of activities/curriculum the staff and children are engaged in. Parent participation was another area of program quality included in the survey.

FINDINGS

Introduction

A total of 130 individual survey instruments were used in the following analysis. In order to both better describe the programs and determine whether significant differences existed, programs were asked to provide information on their affiliation or auspices and their urbanicity. These categories were used in various portions of the analysis. While survey results are not truly representative of the full range of school-age child care programs in the United States, the findings presented here do give some indication of the general parameters of these programs and of some of their strengths and weaknesses. It is important to note that some program affiliations are represented by too few programs to provide for meaningful analysis. In those instances, general categories have been created (e.g., programs run by municipalities and those run by park and recreation departments have been combined).

Geographic Distribution

Programs were located in a total of 13 states. The largest numbers of programs were located in the following states: Minnesota (N=19), Illinois (N=18), New Jersey and Pennsylvania (N=17 each), Florida and Washington (N=14 each), and Southern California (N=13). Alabama, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee were represented by 1 to 4 programs each (for a total of 12 programs) and Oregon by 6 programs.

The majority of programs (53%; N=64) report being located in suburban areas. Programs in urban areas are the next most frequent (36%; N=44), while rural programs (N=14) only account for 12% of the survey sample which provided this information (N with information=122). The majority of the rural programs were located in Pennsylvania and Oregon.

Program Auspices/Affiliation

The largest group of programs (24.6%; N=32) were affiliated with public schools. Child care programs were the next most frequent type of auspice; non-profit child care programs (N=29) account for 22.3% of the sample, for-profit child care programs (N=19) account for 14.6%. Youth serving agencies (N=18) provide 13.8% of the programs followed by church, synagogue or religious schools (12.3%; N=16). The remainder of the survey sample includes programs run by municipal park and recreation

departments (N=6); programs run by social service agencies (N=4); and programs run by the military, municipalities, and colleges (N=6) or 1.5% each.

When examined by state or area, the different paths taken in the organizational development of school-age child care becomes more evident. Public schools were the predominant provider of care in Minnesota and were also heavily represented in the Southern California sample. Youth serving agencies (YMCA and YWCA) were more prevalent in the New Jersey and Pennsylvania programs than in other parts of the country. For-profit child care programs were somewhat more common in the southeastern states, while religiously affiliated programs and non-profit, agency-run programs were fairly evenly dispersed through the survey areas.

Urban SACC programs are more likely to be affiliated with for-profit and non-profit child care agencies (41%); other municipal, youth serving or religious affiliated groups (39%); and less likely to be affiliated with public schools (21%). Suburban programs were equally likely to be under the auspices of child care agencies or public schools (30% each) but most likely (40%) to be affiliated with other types of agencies. Rural programs were predominantly (57%) offered by child care agencies; public schools and other agencies each provided 21% of the program.

PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

Program Operations

The large majority of programs (81%; N=105) report they operate year round; 25 programs or 19% operate during the school year only. Thirty-three programs (25%) provide after-school services only; 97 programs(75%) provide both before and after school components. Among the 25 programs operating during the school year only, services are almost evenly divided between programs offering after school services (13) and those offering before and after school services(12). Year-round programs, on the other hand, report that 81% provide both before and after school care.

When programs are examined by urbanicity, all 14 rural programs provide year round programs. Almost 4 out of 5 urban and suburban programs provide year round programs.

Programs ranged in the number of days of operation per year from 170 days to 280 days. The mean number of days in operation for the 122 programs reporting is 234 days per year; the mode is 251. For programs operating school year only, program services begin between 8/20 and 9/14; 16 of the 25 school year only programs report opening between 9/5 and 9/7. Program services end for these programs in June, the majority (N=15) report closing between 6/15 and 6/30.

77% of all programs reporting are open on school holidays; 81% remain open on school vacations other than summer vacation; 40% are open on snow or earthquake days; but only 15% report being open on school half-days. Public school affiliated

programs are less likely to be open on school holidays and vacations, snow or earthquake days than other types of programs but more likely to be open on school half-days. Only 3 programs report being open on Saturdays or Sundays.

Survey programs report that after school services begin from 12 noon to 3:30 pm. 72% of all programs begin providing services at 2:30 pm. Closing times range from 5:00 to 6:30 pm. The average is 6:00 pm, with 76% of all programs providing care until that time.

Time in Operation

Programs responding to the survey began operations an average of 7 years prior to the 1988 survey. The oldest program began serving school-age children in 1953; the newest began in 1988. The largest number of programs (44%; N=53), were relatively new having started in the last four years; 69% of all programs (N=84) began operations during the last nine years; 31% began services between 1953 and 1978. A significant difference ($p<0.03$) was noted between programs under child care auspices, which were most likely to have begun providing services prior to 1979 and public school programs, only 4 of which delivered services prior to 1979. The majority of public school programs (55%) began operations in the four years prior to the survey. Programs in urban areas were also more likely to have started providing services since 1984 than was true for suburban or rural programs.

97% of all programs report that they were in continuous operation since they began providing program services. Among the 4 programs which report interruption of service, one had fiscal problems and another cited no demand for program services as a reason for discontinuing the program for a period of time.

Number of Sites

The number of sites operated by survey programs range from 1 site (43%; N=55) to 35 (N=1). The mean number of sites is 3.8; the median is 2 sites. The total number of individual sites providing SACC services for the 127 agencies responding to this question is 480.

Significant differences ($p<0.001$) are found in the number of sites operated by survey respondents by program auspice. Child care agencies are more likely (60%) to operate their SACC programs at only one site, as are programs under religious auspices (95%). Public schools (90%) report operating at more than one site; youth serving agencies and other sponsors also are more likely to operate at more than one site (76% and 69% respectively). Rural programs are more likely (77%) than suburban (56%) or urban (53%) programs to operate at 2 or more sites.

Type of Facility

The largest number of survey respondents (41%; N=53) report that their SACC programs are housed in public school buildings. Private buildings, including private

school buildings are used by 30 agencies (23%) of the survey sample; 15% of the programs are housed in church or synagogue facilities (N=20). Community centers, YMCA or YWCA buildings account for 12% of the facilities used. As anticipated, 94% of public school sponsored programs are located in public school buildings; 24% of all other program types (N=23) also report using public school facilities. For child care affiliated programs, public school buildings represent the second most frequent type of facility used (29%) after private buildings (46%). Programs with other types of affiliation use a variety of facilities including community centers and Ys (26%), religious buildings (26%) as well as public schools, although no religiously affiliated programs in the survey were housed in public school facilities.

The use of public school buildings does not appear to be influenced by degree of urbanicity. Rural programs report that 36% of programs are located in public schools; suburban and urban programs report that 41% of the programs use public school facilities. Rural programs do appear to use private buildings slightly more frequently (29%) than urban programs (21%) or suburban programs (23%).

Advantages of Operating in a Public School

In response to open ended questions, two programs said that their schools were simply great locations. A number of programs cited access to specific parts of their school as an advantage. Thirteen respondents mentioned the facilities or equipment generally, and six pointed to school resources as a positive aspect. Four respondents said there was lots of space for their programs; one said there were always playgrounds and rooms available; three mentioned access to school services; and one mentioned the hot lunch program specifically. Opportunities to engage in sports were cited as an advantage by one program, and another mentioned access to the school psychologist.

Transportation came up several times. Fourteen programs said an advantage of locating in a public school was that children did not have to travel to the program, and two additional respondents noted that children were exposed to less risk from transportation related accidents.

The use of rent free space was noted by two programs. Four mentioned the fact that the environment was familiar, and another said it created an easy transition for children. Good teacher relationships and support of the school staff were mentioned by three programs each. Having the opportunity to working with special needs children and having a program geared only to school-age children were advantages cited by one program each. Two programs noted the positive effect of having children in an environment with age-appropriate peers. One program mentioned that regular school session teachers could spend extra time with students and use them as helpers since they stayed on after the school day was over. Another respondent said they felt more a part of the district in the public school; and one felt the program had more credibility in the community as a result of being located in the school.

Eight programs said an important advantage was the accessibility of the program for parents, and three mentioned that it fostered good relations between SACC staff and

parents. Another three cited general safety as an advantage of locating in a public school.

Disadvantages of Operating in a Public School

Programs cited several types of disadvantages associated with public school location, including negative attitudes towards the program from school administration, lack of space, and problems associated with sharing space. Four programs mentioned that the teachers in the public school did not appreciate their presence, two reported difficulties establishing a good relationship with the public school teachers, and two others cited a general lack of support from the administration of the school. One program said they felt they were consistently excluded from school activities, and one said they were the district's lowest priority. Another program said they were blamed for everything that went wrong; one noted they were frequently blamed for missing items.

Problems related to space varied. Three programs reported that they lacked storage space, while two programs pointed out that they had no opportunity to "warm up" the physical environment. Being moved around a great deal by the school was a disadvantage reported by three programs. Four programs reported a general lack of space for their program in the school. Two programs said they felt their space is always being threatened by the school, and sharing space also created problems generally for four programs. Establishing autonomy proved to be a problem for one program.

Being located in a public school is too expensive for two programs, while another mentioned specifically the higher rates custodians charge for working later hours. One program said they found it difficult to expose children to sufficient variety in a public school setting, and another cited problems in following school district guidelines.

Licensing Status

Of the 124 programs reporting licensing status, 85 (69%) state that the program is licensed under existing regulations; 31% are exempt. Five of the exempt programs are voluntarily licensed. Public school programs are the most likely to report being exempt from licensing (79%) compared to 10% of all child care affiliated programs, and 25% of other types of programs. Suburban programs appear far less likely to be licensed (55%) than programs in urban (81%) or rural areas (86%). This finding may reflect the larger number of SACC programs run by public schools in suburban settings.

The licensing agency is predominantly the designated state agency (89%); four percent of programs report the county is the licensing agency. For the public school programs reporting licensure, the board of education or local school board is the regulating agency.

Basis of Operation

89% of all survey programs (N=115) report operating on an enrollment basis only; 2 programs report operating on a drop-in basis exclusively. Twelve programs (9%) indicate they permit drop-ins but also use enrollment.

Minimum Attendance Requirements

Programs appear equally divided between requiring a minimum number of days of attendance for enrollment. 52% have no such regulation; 48% do have this requirement. The average number of minimum attendance days is 2.8 days;the median is 2 days.

Attendance Monitoring

It is reassuring to note that 97% of the survey programs state that attendance is checked regularly. 34% of the programs check attendance at each session; 44% use sign-in sheets; and 22% use some other method. 87% of the programs report taking follow-up action if a child is absent. The majority (77%) of programs taking follow up action report call the child's parent or guardian immediately. Only 6% report waiting a few days before following up.

Types of Records Maintained

Only one agency of the 130 responding to the survey reports that records are not maintained on the children participating in the program. The types of records maintained and their frequency are as follows:

Table 1: Types of Records Maintained

Attendance records	89%
Medical records	85%
Registration/intake records	41%
Emergency contact information	35%
Parental Consent forms	32%
Progress reports	26%
Behavior/incident reports	22%
Proof of income records	9%

Child care affiliated programs appear to be slightly more likely (33%) to keep progress records than public school or other programs (22% each). Public school affiliate programs appear more likely to maintain registration/intake records (53%) and emergency contact records (50%) than child care or other types of programs.

Racial/Ethnic Mix of Participating Children

Information provide by the programs on the racial/ethnic mix of children attending survey programs indicates that 97% of the programs serve white children; 70% serve Black children; 41% serve Asian children; 36% serve Latino children; and 13% serve native american children. While most programs indicate that they do serve specific racial/ethnic groups, few except those serving white children provide the exact percentage served. Among the 97% of programs serving white children, 40% indicate that 75% or more of the children served in these programs are white.

Age Range of Children Served

Ninety-three percent of the programs in the survey report that age 5 is the minimum age served; only 9 programs (7%) report that services begin at age 6. Maximum age ranges from age 8 to age 14. The average maximum age served is 11.5 years; the median is age 12. 22% of all programs set age 11 as the maximum age; 50% of programs (N=83) report that age 12 is the maximum; 9% of programs serve 13 and 14 year olds. No differences in the ages served were noted by program affiliation or urbanicity.

Licensed Site Capacity

The licensed site capacity reported ranged from 6 to 348 school-age children. The mean program capacity was 63 children; the median was 49. With a range of 342 children it is difficult to know whether, in fact, respondents in all instances did provide site specific information or reported licensed capacity for all program sites. 33% of programs report a capacity of 30 or fewer children; an additional 35% have the capacity to serve between 32 and 60 children; and 20% serve between 61 and 100 children. The total licensed capacity reported for 102 sites is 6,402 children.

Enrollment

The total enrollment of children ages 5 through 12 reported by the sites averaged 61; the median number of children enrolled is 50. The range was from 6 to 235. 28% of all programs report enrolling 30 or fewer children; 35% report enrollments between 31 and 60 children; 23% enroll 61 to 100 children at the site.

The programs report enrollment by age group as follows:

Table 2: Enrollment by Age Group

Age Group	Mean Number Served	Range	Total Number
5 year olds (N=99)	17.8	5-90	1,761
6 & 7 yr. olds (N=101)	21.2	3-73	2,142
8 & 9 yr.olds (N=101)	16.2	1-60	1,632
10 & 11 yr.olds (N=84)	8.4	1-44	706
12 yrs and up (N=23)	4.4	1-10	102
Total Number of Children Enrolled			6,343

While the majority of programs may indicate that they would provide services up to age 12, the above table indicates that relatively few do so. The majority of children enrolled are in the 5 to 9 year old category.

Changes in Number of Children Served

Programs were asked if the number of children served during the past two years had changed. Sixty-five percent (N=83) report that the number of kids increased each of the last 2 years; 27% indicate that the numbers remained constant; and 6% say the numbers decreased. Rural programs are more likely (86%) to see increases in numbers served. Public schools are most likely to see increases (81%) and religious groups are more likely to see numbers remain constant (50%) than other program types.

When asked how the number of children served by program will change over the next 2 years, 57% of programs (N=74) foresee an increase in the number of children; 27% feel numbers will remain constant; and 6% think numbers will decrease. Differences by program auspices are similar to those for changes over the past two years.

Eligibility Criteria

Programs were asked to indicate the criteria used to determine program eligibility and whether some criteria carried more weight than others. Only one program reports no eligibility criteria are used to determine which children may enroll in the program. The criteria, their frequency and the percentage of programs considering a specific criteria as very important are as follows:

Table 3: Eligibility Criteria

Criterion	Frequency	% Very Important
Age of Child	88%	8%
Child Attends District School	49%	4%
Child Attends Program School	33%	2%
Family Income	25%	3%
Parent Employment Status	23%	5%
Special Needs: Child	17%	4%
Special Needs: Parent	12%	2%
Race/Ethnicity	2%	0
English Second Lang.	2%	1%
Other Family Characteristics	11%	2%

As expected public school affiliated programs were more likely (41%) to state that attendance at the program school was an important criteria, as compared to 32% for child care programs and 30% for other program types. Child care and public school programs were also more likely (51% and 53% respectively) to require attendance at the district school than other programs (44%). Family income, on the other hand, was of minimum importance to public schools; child care programs were twice as likely to use this criterion than other programs. Parental employment status was also more important to child care programs (32%) that other programs types (public schools 16%; other programs 20%). Special needs of children also appears to be a more important criteria for child care programs (23%). Other family characteristics and special needs of parents appear to play almost no role in deciding which children are served in public school affiliated programs in this survey.

Program Vacancies

61% of the programs (N=78) report vacancies at the time of the survey. Of the programs reporting vacancy information, 63% provided information on the number of vacancies (N=49). The average number of vacancies is 18.6; the median is 12; and the range is from 1 to 153. The total number of vacancies reported by the 49 programs is 909. Fewer child care programs (55%) report vacancies than public school programs (69%) or other programs (60%).

Waiting Lists

54 programs (42%) report waiting lists. (Two or three programs apparently reported both vacancies and waiting lists). Public school programs appeared slightly less likely to report waiting lists (53%) than other program types (60%). Waiting lists ranged from 2 to 300 children. The average waiting list is 28.8 children, the median is 12. Given an average enrollment per site of 61 (see section on enrollment) the average

waiting list appears to be almost half average enrollment. 44% of programs report between 2 and 10 children are wait listed; 26% report that 11 to 20 children are on waiting lists; and 20% report between 23 and 50 children are on the lists. A total of 1,439 children are reported to be on 50 program's waiting lists, or 23% of the reported enrollment in these programs.

Of the 92 programs providing information on policy for filling vacancies, 69% indicate the existence of some criteria (although little information was provided on the specific criteria). Somewhat surprisingly, 60% of these same programs indicate that openings are filled on a first come first served basis.

Methods Used to Recruit Clients: Advertising Sources

The following methods are used by survey programs to advertise services. The most effective methods are starred.

Table 4: Advertising Sources

Local Government Service Listings	100%
Word of Mouth	94% *
School Notices	73% *
Child Care Resource and Referral Agency	59%
Flyers	56%
Newspaper Advertisements	51%
Yellow Pages	36%
Presentations	36%
Advertising Door to Door	3%

At least half of all programs use five methods for advertising their program. The most popular and most effective is word of mouth and school notices. A surprisingly large percentage list programs at local resource and referral agencies, but it is not considered especially effective.

Requests for Additional Services

Eighty-two percent (N=101) of programs report having requests for services they are unable to provide. This situation is most prevalent for public schools (100%; N=29) and least prevalent for religiously affiliated programs (50%; N=8). The most frequently requested services are listed in the table below.

Table 5: Requests for Additional Services

Care for Mildly Ill Children	44%
Care on Days When School Closed	36%
Care for Special Needs Children	34%
Care for Low Income Children	33%
Summer Program	22%

Youth serving agency programs do not report requests for summer programs and for-profit programs are only half as likely to have requests to serve low income children.

The majority of programs (59%) feel that these additional service requests could be met with increased funding, 28% would need more space, 13% need more qualified staff, but only 8% feel that less stringent regulations would allow the program to provide requested services.

QUALITY OF STAFF

It is important to note that in many programs positions below the Center or Program Director may have a variety of names. Thus in one program the highest direct care position may be Group Leader, with requirements which in another program would be expected from a Teacher, namely a BA, a minimum age of 21 and 2 years of experience. This stands in contrast to other programs where the group leader is only expected to have completed high school. In general, there is a tendency to reduce minimum requirements as the staff positions move down from Director to assistants or aides (see Table 6).

In evaluating the range of requirements for each position, two things must be kept in mind: 1) programs use their own self-anchoring set of minimum qualifications depending on their unique staffing patterns and in some instances licensing standards; and 2) the data presented should be viewed as suggestive only, since no attempt was made to regroup the responses so that in instances where there were equivalent requirements for group leaders and teachers, the data was merged and presented as information on all possible categories of employees occupying that role (highest level of direct service staff).

Programs were also asked for minimum age and years of experience for each relevant position. In several instances, replies appeared to be provided in terms of the individual occupying the position rather than minimum requirements for the position. Answers appearing to be tied to current occupants have been excluded from the following discussion.

Minimum Level of Education

Center Directors Of the 96 programs reporting, the majority (63%) require a BA and 20% require a Masters Degree. 10% of the programs require only 2 years of college. 7 programs (7%) only require a high school diploma, GED or some high school.

Program Directors are about equally likely to be required to have a BA (61%) as Center Directors but less likely to need an MA (4%). A larger proportion (29%) of programs accept 2 years of college as compared to 10% for center directors. 7% of programs require only a High School/GED degree. Child care agencies appear to be

much more likely (44%) to accept 2 years of college as compared to 9% for public schools and 29% of other programs.

Teachers/Senior Staff/Senior Care Givers For the 82 programs providing information, Teachers appear to be about equally likely to be required to have a high school diploma (31%); 2 years of college (31%); or a BA (38%); only 1% require an MA. Public schools (43%) and child care programs (38%) are more likely to require a BA than programs under other auspices (27%), which are much more likely to only require a high school diploma/GED (40%).

Specialists are used by relatively few programs (N=18). The largest percentage (44%) of programs require a BA but 25% each require 2 years of college or only a high school education.

Group Leaders are used by 41 programs. The majority (58%) of programs require only a high school education; 3% may have less than a high school diploma. 31% must have 2 years of college; only 8% require a BA. Child care programs are much more likely (43%) to require at least 2 years of college compared to public schools (11%) or other programs (22%).

Aides/Assistant Teachers are used by 79 programs, of which 80% require only a high school diploma/GED; 16% may have less than high school. Only 4% need to have even 2 years of college. Once again, child care programs are more likely to have higher education requirements than other types of program.

Assistant Group Leaders are used by 19 programs. 65% require a high school diploma/GED; 29% require only some high school. Only 6% need to have a BA.

Table 6: Minimum Level of Education, Mean Age and Experience

	<HS	HS/ GED	2 yr coll.	BA	MA/ MSW	Mean Min Age Req.	Mean/Min Exp. Req.
Center Director	2%	5%	10%	63%	20%	20.3	2.95
Program Director	-0-	7%	29%	61%	4%	20.3	2.4
Teacher	-0-	31%	42%	38%	1%	19.4	1.8
Specialist	6%	25%	25%	44%	-0-	19.9	2.00
Group Leader	3%	58%	31%	8%	-0-	18.2	1.9
Aide/Asst Teacher	16%	80%	4%	-0-	-0-	17.7	1.4
Asst Group Leader	29%	65%	6%	-0-	-0-	17.4	1.9

Minimum Age

As with education, minimum age requirements decrease with the level of position.[1] The mean age for Center and Program Directors is 20.3. The range is from 17 to 25. Teachers' average age is 19.6 and Specialists' average age is 19.9. The range for Teachers is from 17 to 25; for Specialists it is from 16 to 25. Group Leaders range from 16 to 21 years of age; the mean is 18.2. Aides or Assistant Teachers range from 14 to 21 with an average of 17.7 years; Assistant Group Leaders average requirement is 17.4, with a range from 16 to 20. The minimum age requirements are in fairly good congruence with education requirements. For example, 29% of Assistant Group Leaders only need some high school and the minimum age for 33% of this category is 16. Conversely, 61% of Program Directors are expected to have a BA and 55% have a minimum age requirement of 21.

Minimum Years of Experience

The average minimum experience requirements range from 2.95 years for Center Directors to 1.4 years for Aides/Assistant Teachers. All positions through Group Leader range from 1 to 5 years; the range for Aides/Assistant Teachers and Assistant Group Leaders is from 1 to 3 years. The median minimum level of experience for Center Directors is 3 years; for Program Directors, Teachers, Specialists, Assistant Group Leaders, 2 years; for Group Leaders, 1.5 years; and for Aides or Assistant Teachers 1.0 years. Teachers in public school programs are more likely (54%) to require only 1 year of experience for this position as compared to the average of 2 years. Child care programs, on the other hand, appear to require less experience for Program Directors (86% require 2 years or less) than do public schools and other programs (50% and 55% require more than 2 years, respectively).

Type of Certification Required

Table 7: Minimum Certification Requirements

	None	Tchr	MSW/ Cert	Admin Prof	ECE Cert	CDA	Other
Center Director	36%	13%	1%	7%	13%	5%	24%
Program Director	45%	14%	--	--	14%	2%	23%
Teacher	42%	17%	--	--	11%	7%	24%
Group Leader	64%	--	--	--	3%	6%	27%
Aide/Asst Teacher	69%	--	--	--	3%	4%	24%
Asst Group Leader	74%	--	--	--	--	--	26%

[1]State licensing or other applicable standards often include both age and education minimum requirements, although in many instances minimum age appears to be a corollary of the education requirement.

Certification requirements are more frequent for Center Directors (64%); Program Directors (55%); and Teachers (58%). They are less frequent for Group Leaders (36%); Aides (31%); and Assistant Group Leaders (26%). Somewhat surprisingly, only between 13 and 17% of Director and Teacher positions require teacher certificates, and only Center Director positions require Administration or Supervisory certifications (7%). Early Childhood Education certification (ECE) is required by 11 to 14% of these positions while only 3% each of Group Leaders and Aides/Assistant Teachers require an ECE as a minimum type of certification. The Child Development Associate credential (CDA) as minimum certification is accepted by only 2 to 7% of the programs; for Teachers 7% of programs recognize the CDA; for Group Leaders 6% of the programs; but only 2% of programs accept this type of minimum certification for Program Directors.

As expected, public schools are more likely (82%) to require some form of certification for teachers than child care (58%) and other programs (33%); 29% of public schools require teacher certifications as compared to 16% for child care and 11% for other programs. Public schools are also far more likely to require certifications for Center Directors (86%) than child care (45%) and other programs (68%). In general, CDA certification and ECE certification is rarely recognized by public schools; most CDAs are recognized by child care affiliated programs.

Number and Type of Staff Employed by Program

The total number of staff employed by the programs ranges from 1 to 35. 35% of the programs employ 5 or less staff; 67% employ 10 or less staff; 89% employ 20 or fewer staff. The mean number of staff employed by the programs is 9.98; the median is 7. The programs providing information (N=123) employ a total of 1,228 staff.

One hundred twenty three programs report employing 1 or more Center or Program Directors; 67% report 1 person in that position; 91% report up to 2 persons in those positions. 79 programs employ classroom teachers; 58% of the programs employ 1 or 2 teachers. Only 22 programs use specialists; 57 programs employ Group Leaders or Counselors. 79 programs use some type of paraprofessionals (Aides, Assistants); 42 programs report using Volunteers. 11 programs report employing a secretary; only 2 employ a bookkeeper; and 8 programs have a cook.

ADULT STAFF ENVIRONMENTS

It is not surprising that the average number of hours worked per week ranges from a high of 37 for Center Directors to a low of 22 for Aides; what is somewhat unexpected is the consistency in the number of weeks worked per year from a low average of 45 weeks per year for Group Leaders and Aides to a high of 48 for Center Directors. The mean wages across positions are also somewhat expected since one presumes that education and experience are rewarded to some extent. What is striking is the spread between the highest and the lowest average hourly wages, particularly for

Center and Program Directors; a spread of $23 per hour. For teachers the average wage spread is $11 per hour, and for positions below Teacher the spread is between $3 per hour and $6 per hour, which although narrower is still significant.

The low end of the average hourly wage range is also somewhat surprising since those at the Director level are above minimum wage while some teachers and positions below this rank barely reach the minimum wage. When hours worked per week by teachers was analyzed by program auspices, teachers work on average more hours per week in child care programs (32 hrs) than in public schools or religious programs (29 hrs), and work least in youth and other programs (27.5 hours per week). The differences were not significant. Weeks worked per year were lowest in youth serving agency programs (42 weeks) and highest in child care and religiously affiliated programs (47/48 weeks). these differences were not significant.

Table 8: Weeks, Hours, and Wages

	Ctr Dir	Prog Dir	Teach	Grp Ldr	Aide	Asst Teach
Hours Worked per Week						
$\bar{X}$	37	34	29.5	23	22	24
Median	40	40	30	20	20	22
Range	2-80	5-60	2-45	2-40	3-40	9-40
Weeks Worked per Year						
$\bar{X}$	48	47	46	45	45	46
Median	50	50	50	50	50	50
Range	32-52	11-52	25-52	36-52	20-52	20-52
Average Hourly Wage						
$\bar{X}$	$10.63	$10.01	$6.95	$5.44	$5.01	$4.40
Median	10.25	8.71	6.50	5.25	4.52	4.43
Range - lowest	4.00	4.25	3.50	3.35	3.35	3.25
to highest	27.00	27.72	14.50	9.32	9.04	6.50
Minimum Hourly Wage						
$\bar{X}$	$9.43	$8.71	$6.24	$4.99	$4.56	$4.16
Maximum Hourly Wage						
$\bar{X}$	$12.45	$11.30	$7.94	$6.45	$5.77	$4.99

When examined by urbanicity, the mean hours worked by teachers was 29.6 hours; the range was 27.0 hourse in surburban program to 34.5 hours in rural programs. The average number of weeks worked per year is 46. The range is from 45.1 in suburban programs to 47.1 in urban and suburban programs. The results were not significant.

To better understand what these salaries figures mean, annual salaries were calculated using mean hours worked per week, average weeks worked per year, and average hourly wage yields.

Table 9: Average Salary

Position	Approximate Average Annual Salary
Center Director	$18,879
Program Director	$15,996
Teacher	$9,431
Group Leader	$5,630
Aide	$4,960
Assistant Teacher	$4,858

Even were one to use a 40 hour work week for 50 weeks per year for those at the lowest end of the pay scale, the salary for an Assistant Teacher would still be only $8,800 for full time work. This is 2.4 times less than a Center Director would make on average for the same hours and weeks worked. Teachers would only earn $13,900 for a 40 hour work week, 50 weeks a year. Given that 70% of teachers must have at least some college it would appear that these average wages represent a rather poor return on investment. For Aides, Assistant Teachers, and Group Leaders, their annualized wages put them into very low income categories indeed; depending on family size these workers are probably welfare eligible - as would be some teachers. In 1988, the poverty threshold for a family of 3 was $9,431 a year.

To better understand differences in salaries between programs with different affiliations, teachers salaries were compared by affiliation, geographical area and urbanicity.

The mean hourly wage for teachers ranged from $4.90 in for-profit child care to $9.36 per hour in public schools. Programs provided by municipalities and their departments (Parks and Recreation) averaged $8.32 an hour. Church and synagogue programs average $5.75 per hour. The overall variance between groups was significant ($F = 11.92$; $p < 0.001$). Differences between groups were not tested.

Table 10: Average Hourly Wage for Teachers (N=88)

Program Affiliation	Average Hourly Wage
Child Care For-profit (14)	$4.90
Child Care Non-Profit (21)	6.95
Church/Synagogue (14)	5.78
Public School (21)	9.36
Park & Rec/Municipality (4)	8.33
Youth (9)	6.16
Other (5)	6.24
Overall Average	$6.95[2]

Differences in hourly wages for teachers were not significant when examined by urbanicity. Of the 81 programs reporting, the average hourly wage was $7.06 an hour. The range was from $5.97 in rural areas to $7.24 in suburban areas.

Significant differences were found across states or geographic areas in teachers' salaries ($F=9.11$; $p<0.001$). See Table A-II in the Appendix. The range by state was from a low in southeastern states of $4.45 an hour to a high in New Jersey of $9.51. When states in the same geographical area were compared the following differences were noted between states. State differences in average hourly teacher wages was found to be significant, between New Jersey (average wage $9.51) and Pennsylvania ($6.18) ($F=13.7$; $p<0.001$); between Illinois ($6.45) and Minnesota ($8.11) ($F=6.56$; $p<0.02$); and between northwestern states (Oregon and Washington, average $5.73) and Southern California ($7.65) ($F=5.8$; $p<0.03$).

Staff Salaries and Benefits in Programs Run by Public Schools

In addition to public school affiliated programs, 2 child care programs report that teachers and other staff are school district employees (N providing information=31). But, only 7 of these programs report that staff receive comparable salaries to public school employees and only 17 programs report comparable benefits.

[2]The National Child Care Staffing Study (Whitebook, Howes & Phillips, 1989) reports 1988 average pre-school teachers' hourly salaries by educational level: $4.74 with High School or less; $5.56 with some college; and $6.53 with a BS or BA degree. When the overall pre-school teacher's hourly salary of $5.70 is compared with the survey's average salary, $6.95 does not appear so low.

Staff Benefits

Seventy-two percent (N=93) of all programs report that they provide benefits for their staff. Child care and public school affiliated programs are more likely to provide benefits (77% and 72% respectively) than other program types (66%). The most frequent benefits provided are as follows (84 programs provided specific benefit information), overall and by program affiliation.

Table 11: Staff Benefits

Benefit	% of Progs	% by Program Affiliation		
		Child Care	Public Schools	Other
Health Insurance	76%	74%	78%	77%
Sick Days	71%	74%	72%	68%
Paid Vacations	69%	80%	44%	71%
Holidays with Pay	30%	49%	22%	13%
Other Benefits	29%	31%	22%	29%
Dental Insurance	29%	23%	50%	23%
Personal Days	29%	43%	28%	13%
Life Insurance	21%	29%	28%	10%
Retirement Plan	19%	11%	6%	36%
Reduced Fee Child Care	10%	14%	-0-	10%
Parental Leave	4%	3%	-0-	7%

The most popular benefits are health insurance, sick days, and paid vacations, provided by 69 to 76% of the programs providing specific benefit information. Holidays with pay, dental insurance and personal days are provided by about 29% of the programs. Somewhat surprisingly, only 10% of the programs provide their employees with reduced fee child care and only 4% provide parental leave. Among the other benefits provided by programs, the most frequent benefit is tuition assistance for professional courses (9 programs); disability insurance (3); bereavement leave with pay (3); and unemployment insurance (2). One program pays a "stay well" bonus, and one provides flexitime. Two programs provide cafeteria benefits under a Dependent Care Assistance Program.

When compared to findings from the National Child Care Staffing Study (Whitebook, Howes & Phillips, 1989), the benefits provided by SACC in America respondents look quite impressive. In the Staffing Study only 40% of pre-school teachers received health coverage. As in our survey only 20% had retirement plans. Sick leave, paid holidays, and reduced fees for child care were the only benefits offered to a majority of staff. Our survey findings indicate a much lower percentage offering holidays with pay (30%) and only 10% reduce fees for staff children attending the program.

In looking at benefits by program auspices, child care programs appear to provide relatively high benefit levels. Public schools are noticeably active with health and dental insurance, but less likely to provide paid vacations, retirement plans or reduced fee child care than child care and other programs. Other programs are less likely to provide personal days, life insurance, and holidays with pay than child care programs but more likely to provide retirement plans. In many respects, the benefit patterns reported resemble those provided by other service sector employers. Interestingly, only 14 programs (11%) report that employees belong to a union or bargaining unit.

Staff Development and Training

A total of 125 programs, or 97%, report providing staff training opportunities. The following table indicates the frequency with which specific training opportunities are available.

Table 12: Staff Training

Type of Training	Percent of Programs
Preservice	50%
Inservice	
1 to 2 a year	38%
> 2 a year	54%
Professional Days	30%
School Visits/Observation of Other Programs	51%
Reimbursement for Professional Conferences	79%
Reimbursement for Relevant Course Work	43%
Other Training Opportunities	10%

In general, child care and public school programs are equally as likely to provide most of the above staff development and training opportunities. The one exception is reimbursement for course work, where public schools are less likely (33%) than child care and other programs to participate. Other program types in general provide less training opportunities than child care and public school programs.

Staff Meetings

Ninety-three percent of the programs report regular staff meetings. Meetings are held with the following frequency:

Table 13: Frequency of Staff Meetings

Once a Week	30%
Every 2 Weeks	15%
Once a Month	46%
Every 6 Months	10%

Non-profit child care and other programs (i.e. military, college, municipal, and park and recreation programs) are far more likely (57% and 50% respectively) to meet once a week than other program types. Religiously affiliated programs are most likely (75%) to hold meetings once a month. Youth serving agencies are most likely to meet every 2 weeks. Among the 11 programs reporting no regular meetings, the religiously affiliated programs predominate (19%).

Career Ladders

Fifty-four programs (42%) report that a career ladder is in place for teachers. Non-public school or child care affiliated programs are somewhat less likely (33%) to have a career ladder.

Staff Turnover

One hundred and ten (110) or 85% of the survey respondents report staff turnover during the last year of operation. Programs run by youth agencies appear to have slightly greater turnover than the average. The total number of staff leaving was 424, ranging from 1 to 15; the average was 4. 35 programs reported losing from 1 to 5 professional staff; the average was 1.7. The average number of paraprofessionals leaving was 3.5 for the 56 programs providing this information; the range was from 1 to 12. Based on the average number of staff employed by survey respondents (10), the average number of staff leaving the programs (4) in the past year yields an estimated average annual turnover rate of 40%. This finding is consistent with the findings of an average annual turnover rate of 41% across pre-school child care programs in the National Child Care Staffing Study (Whitebook, Howes & Phillips, 1989).

Twenty-nine percent (N=38) of the programs still reported staff vacancies at the time of the survey. The vacancies in the programs ranged from 1 to 10 (average 1.7). Religiously affiliated programs appear to be least likely (13%) to have vacancies at the time of the survey. The programs reported that the majority of current staff vacancies were for paraprofessional positions. The positions had been open for an average of 5.9 weeks (range 1 to 13 weeks). Child care (68%) and public school (83%) affiliated programs appear more likely to fill their staff vacancies within a 4 week period than other types of programs (40%).

Participation in Local Child Care Community

Programs were asked how teachers and other staff participate in the local School Age Child Care and/or early childhood community. The most frequent type of involvement (84%;N=107) is attending local early childhood/SACC conferences. Public school affiliated programs (93%) and child care programs (89%) appear more likely than other programs (74%) to attend these conferences. Over three-fifths (64%) of program staff also are members of local child care professional organizations. Again, child care (79%) and public school (70%) affiliated programs appear more likely to be involved with local child care organizations than other agencies (46%). Membership in local child care councils is reported by 32% of survey respondents; no differences were noted by program auspices.

Staff-Child Ratios

The wide range of staff-child ratios reported by survey respondents holds for every age group.

Table 14: Staff-Child Ratios

Ratio	Age 5	6-7	8-9	10-11	12 and up
$\bar{X}$	1:11.4	1:12.5	1:12.7	1:13.1	1:13.4
Median	1:10	1:12	1:12	1:12	1:14
Range - lowest	1:1	1:2	1:4	1:4	1:5
to highest	1:20	1:25	1:25	1:25	1:25

The lowest end of the range is 1:1 for 5 year olds who also have the lowest average ratios, 1:11.4. While there are few programs (N=7 or 6%) permitting 1:20 ratios for this age, 24% of the programs do permit ratios of 1:15 and higher. As expected, the ratios increase with age; what is less expected is how little difference (less than 6%) is noted in the average ratio between ages 6 and 7 and age 12 and up. Less than 12% of the programs permit ratios of 1:15 or above for 6 to 9 year olds; while only 14% permit this ratio for 10 and 11 year olds and 16% for ages 12 and up. From survey findings, it would appear that 5 year olds are twice as likely to find themselves in programs using 1:15 ratio or higher as 6 to 9 year olds but this finding is based on a relatively small number of programs.

It is somewhat reassuring to note that no program in this study permits ratios above 1:25. In the New York City study (Seligson, Marx & Feldman, 1988) ratios as high as 1:45 were reported for children as young as age five and this was true across all age groups. Average ratios across age groups were found to be highest in public school affiliated programs (1:30 and 1:32); this included ratios reported by school run programs for 5 year olds.

In order to better understand differences, in staff child ratios, ratios for 6 and 7 year olds (the most frequently served age group) were examined by program auspice, urbanicity and geographic area.

Table 15: Ratio of Staff to 6 and 7 year Olds

Program Affiliation	Mean Ratio
Child Care For-profit (N=19)	1:13.5
Child Care Non-Profit (N=29)	1:12.5
Church/Synagogue (N=16)	1:13.4
Public School (N=32)	1:13.1
Municipal/Parks and Recreation (N=8)	1:10.8
Youth Programs (N=18)	1:10.2
Other (N=8)	1:13.4
Total (N=130)	1:12.5
Range 1:2 to 1:25	

While the differences between groups do not quite reach significance ($p<0.06$), it is striking that municipal and youth organizations both maintain far lower ratios than other types of agencies. The highest ratios are found in for-profit child care programs, churches/synagogues, and public schools. Yet, despite these differences, the spread between mean ratios for this age group is only 3.3 children.

No significant differences were noted when ratios for 6 and 7 year olds were examined by state. The range by state of mean ratio was from a high of 1:14.6 in the southeastern states (AL, GA, NC, SC, TN) to a low of 1:10.8 in Pennsylvania (see Table A-II in Appendix). Degree of urbanicity also did not show a significant difference in ratios for this age group. Rural programs showed the lowest ratios (1:11.3); urban programs showed the highest ratios (1:12.9). See Table A-III in Appendix.

In response to the question as to who is counted as staff to determine the ratio, Teachers are the most frequently counted staff (92%), followed by paraprofessionals (61%) and high school students (23%). Volunteers, parents, and non-teaching professional staff account for 5% or less. No differences were noted in who is counted in the ratios by program affiliation.

QUALITY OF PROGRAM

Parent Participation

One important measure of the quality of all child care programs including school-age child care is the level of parent participation. The following table provides information on various provisions make by programs for parent participation. Of the 12

types of participation mentioned, newsletters and other forms of written communication are by far the most popular; 82% of all programs report using this method.

Table 16: Parent Participation

Type of Participation	% of Programs
Newsletter/Written Communication	82%
Parent Opinions Solicited Regularly	68%
Orientation Prior to Program Participation	65%
Parent/Teacher Conferences	62%
Parents on Advisory Board	51%
Fund Raising	44%
Parents Volunteer for Program	39%
Parent Education/Workshops Offered	26%
Parents Employed by Program	25%
Parents Involved with Program Development	22%
Parents Involved in Setting Program Policy	21%
Parents Involved in Setting Fees	15%

Soliciting parent opinion (68%), parent orientation (65%), and parent teacher conferences (62%) are also frequently cited vehicles for parent participation. Approximately half the programs have parents sit on advisory boards or boards of directors, but interestingly one-fifth or fewer parents make substantive decisions regarding such things as program development, setting program policy, or setting fees. Parents are at least twice as likely (41%) to be involved in fund raising or in policy making roles (15 to 21%).

When parent participation is examined by program auspices, non-profit child care programs are the most likely (76%) to have parents on their boards of directors; 66% of the public schools and 61% of youth serving agencies report this type of parent participation. None of the for-profit child care programs report that parents serve in this capacity and only 31% of the religiously affiliated programs in the survey report parent representation on their governing boards. Public schools indicate that they are more likely to solicit parent opinion (81%) than child care programs (64%), religiously affiliated programs (56%) or youth agency programs (50%). Interestingly, there is almost no difference between for-profit and non-profit child care programs on this variable (63% and 66% respectively).

Parents are far more likely to fund raise for non-profit child care programs (83%) than in for-profit child care programs (47%), youth agency programs (39%), public school affiliated programs (25%), or religiously affiliated programs (6%). Parent education/workshops are also more frequently provided by non-profit child care programs (45%) than public school (25%) or for-profit child care programs (21%).

In keeping with other findings on the parent participation variable (see above), public schools also appear more likely (38%) to permit parent involvement in program

development than other types of programs including non-profit child care (24%). Nonetheless, overall survey programs show a low level (22%) of this type of parent involvement. Public schools are almost equally likely to have parents involved in setting program policy (34%) as non-profit child care programs (38%). This finding becomes more striking when it is compared with other program types which report only 5% to 11% parent involvement in setting program policy. Public schools also permit parental involvement in fee setting more frequently (34%) than in non-profit child care (24%) or other program types which range from 0% (for-profit child care) to 6% (youth agency programs).

Transportation

Sixty-nine percent (N=89) of the 130 programs surveyed provide some level of transportation. 74 programs (60%) provide school to program transportation; only 3 programs provide program to home transportation. Only 15 programs (18%) state that they charge a fee for transportation. The nine programs reporting on fees charged for transportation range from $4 per week to $10 per week. The average fee per week for these 9 programs is $6.78. One-third of the programs (N=25) report problems with transportation arrangements. The most frequently cited problems are costs, transportation routes, and difficulties in hiring a driver. No significant differences were found in the availability of transportation by degree of urbanicity.

Program Space

Survey respondents were asked to describe the primary space they used for their programs on a daily basis. Thirty percent (N=38) report the program is primarily located in one large room; 70% (N=90) report they have access to rooms for each age group. For-profit child care programs appear to be more likely (50%) than other program types (20% to 30%) to be housed in one large room. Programs housed in private buildings (38%) and public schools (42%) appear to be far more likely to be located in one large room (rather than having a room for each age group) than those housed in community centers (6%), religious buildings (16%) or other facilities (9%).

Seventy-one percent of the survey respondents (N=92) report that separate office space is available for the program. Public school affiliated programs are somewhat less likely (59%) and for-profit child care programs are somewhat more likely (90%) to have office space than other types of program. Programs located in public school buildings are also less likely (59%) to have separate office space; programs using private space are most likely to have office space (83%).

95% of survey programs (N=123) indicate that they use additional space or facilities on a regular basis within the building in which they are located. The most frequently used spaces are as follows:

Table 17: Additional Space Used

Playground	97%
Gym	51%
Lunchroom	38%
Library	23%
Auditorium	20%
Pool	11%
Art Room	11%
Computer Room	5%
Kitchen	4%

Outdoor playgrounds, gyms, and lunchrooms are clearly the most frequently used additional space. Not unexpectedly, public school affiliated programs are more likely to have use of the gym (69%); the lunchroom (63%) and the library (40%). Youth serving agency (Y's, etc.) programs are more likely to have use of the pool (24%) than other program types. For-profit child care programs appear less likely than other program types to have access to a gym (22%); a library (6%); or an auditorium (11%).

Which type of facility a program is located in also appears to have a direct impact on the types of additional facilities available to the program. For example, programs housed in private buildings are less likely to have use of the gym, pool, or auditorium than other programs housed in other facilities. Public school facilities make it more likely that programs have used of a gym, lunchroom, and library.

Programs were also asked if they used other facilities in the community on a regularly scheduled basis. 50% of survey programs (N=64) responding indicated they do so. Religious affiliated programs appear more likely (73%) and public school affiliated programs less likely (36%) to make use of community facilities than other program types. Being housed in religious facilities makes a program more likely (70%) to make use of community resources than being housed in a public school (32%). As we have seen above, public school housed programs may not need to make use of community resources since they do have access to a greater range of resources within the facility and appear to make at least some of these resources available to other programs using their buildings.

The most frequently mentioned community facilities are public parks; used by 58% of those reporting use of community facilities; 38% use public pools. Libraries are used by 19% and an additional 14% use public skating rinks. Other community facilities used by a limited number of respondents include community center gyms, boys and girls clubs, bowling alleys, art centers, and public playgrounds. Public schools are the most likely and for-profit child care programs least likely to use public parks. Being housed in a public school also makes it more likely that a program will use public parks; being housed in a private building makes it less likely. Religiously affiliated programs make the most use of public pools; while programs housed in public schools appear to be less likely to use public pools than those in other types of facility.

Impact of Public School Location on the Continuity of Care

Another open ended question asked whether the fact of being located in a public school had an impact on the continuity of the child's day between the regular school and after school program. Thirteen respondents said that care was seen to be positively impacted by the fact that their programs were located in a public school. Other programs also felt positive about the continuity provided by the school setting. Three programs indicated they had excellent coordination with their school; six pointed to the advantage of a familiar place and of not having to change locations; one program mentioned that parents did not need to worry about transportation; and another noted that trust between parents and staff was increased through locating in a public school. Parents also have better communication with staff, according to four programs. Three programs cited good continuity of care for special needs students in particular. Not having to transport children also saves time, three programs noted; one program indicated that some of their students do have to take a bus from another school, however.

Access to certain aspects of public schools was cited by several programs. One appreciated that both the program and the school were governed by the same school board. One program each mentioned the large space available, the ability to increase enrollment, lower overhead, and greater access to resources.

Meals

Ninety-seven percent (N=126) of the survey programs report that they serve some type of meal: 49% serve breakfast, 41% serve lunch, and less than 1% provide dinner. All 126 programs provide snacks. Breakfast is more likely to be provided by child care programs (70%) than public schools (44%) or other programs (32%). Lunch follows a similar pattern. Breakfast is also more likely to be provided by year round programs (58%) than school year only programs (13%). Lunch follows a similar pattern.

Program Activities

Programs were asked to list the types of activities provided. The frequency with which special activities are offered is as follows.

Table 18: Program Activities

	%	N
Arts and Crafts	100%	130
Free Time	99%	128
Resting/Quiet Time	93%	121
Reading	90%	117
Athletics	86%	112
Field Trips	85%	111
Homework Help	85%	111
Cooking/Food Preparation	79%	102
Safety Education	75%	97
Music	74%	96
Group Discussions	72%	93
Educational Enrichment	69%	89
Health/Nutrition Education	62%	80
Dance	45%	59
Theater	32%	42
Tutoring	25%	33
Other Activities	25%	33
Remedial Education	12%	16
Bilingual Activities	7%	9
Foreign Languages	7%	9
Computer Education	7%	9
Scouting/Youth Clubs	6%	8
Gymnastics/Aerobics	4%	5
Swimming/Skating	2%	3

Twelve (12) program activities are offered by at least half of the survey programs. Arts and crafts, free time, quiet time, reading, athletics, homework help and field trips are provided by 85 to 100% of the programs. 60 to 79% of the programs provide opportunities for food preparation, safety education, music, group discussion, educational enrichment and health/nutrition education. Dance, theater and tutoring are provided by 25 to 45% of the programs. The range, composition and frequency of activities offered suggest that most programs are providing relaxed and fairly well-rounded programs.

When activities are compared across program auspices, for-profit child care programs appear to provide the following activities more frequently than other program types: educational enrichment, remedial education, tutoring, athletics, group discussions and food preparation are offered less frequently than by other program types. Religiously affiliated programs are less likely to provide dance, health, nutrition and safety education but more likely to provide group discussions and athletics. Public school programs are more likely to provide music, dance, theater and cooking than other program types. Contrary to some expectations, the for-profit child care programs appear to be more heavily into education-related activities than public school affiliated programs.

Selection of Activities

Programs were asked how children selected activities and 125 programs responded. The most prevalent method used is free choice (39%), followed by some assignment, some choice (31%). Programs which provide for more choice than assignment accounts for 14%; those with more assignment than choice 6%. Only 6% of all respondents indicate that all activities are assigned. Child care programs appear to be most committed to providing free choice (49%) and less likely to use assignment some or all of the time. Public schools while also permitting free choice as the most prevalent form of selection do use some or all assignment more than child care or other programs.

Eighty-five percent (N=106) of the programs indicate that children are provided with opportunities to engage in individual self-directed activities. The ways in which this is accomplished includes: the allotment of free time each day (31%); children select from a prearranged set of activities (39%); materials and games are available for individual choice (37%); and children are free not to participate in prearranged activities (14%). Public schools are less likely to set aside free time for self directed activities (26%) than child care (58%) or other programs (61%). Child care programs appear to give children greater opportunity not to participate in activities (26%) than public schools (13%) or other programs (4%).

Age Specific and Culturally Sensitive Activities

Ninety-one programs (78%) indicate that activities provided are age specific. All public school programs indicate they tailor activities to the age of the child. Programs were asked whether and what types of special provisions were made for older children to reflect their need for autonomy both inside and outside the program. Of the 110 programs responding, 79% do make provisions for older children. Public school programs appear to be more likely (96%) to make these provisions than other program types. The provisions made for older children include: older kids have more free time and choice of activities (19%); older children are encouraged to help with younger children (38%); older children get special training, such as home safety, first aid etc. (5%); older kids have their own space or equipment (21%); older kids have their own group or club (12%); older kids act as group helpers (27%). Public school affiliated programs appear more likely to provide older kids with increased free time and activity choice and provide for special groups or clubs than other programs.

Programs were also asked if activities were offered which were sensitive to the varying racial, ethnic and cultural backgrounds of the children attending. 75 of 115 programs (65%) responded that their programs did provide such activities. Public school and child care programs are more likely than other programs to provide this type of activity. 38% of programs conduct specific activities around different religious holidays; 25% provide programs which feature different cultures on a regular basis; 18% provide special materials reflecting cultural diversity.

Additional Activities

Of 112 programs, 63 (56%) indicated that there were additional activities they should offer to ensure a well-balanced program. Child care programs are less likely than other program types to share this opinion. The most frequently noted additional activities which should be offered include:

Table 19: Additional Activities

More Physical Activities	24%
More Emphasis on Art and Music	13%
More Programs for Older Kids	11%
More Homework Help	7%

Special Needs

Eighty-eight (68%) survey programs accept children with special needs. Public schools appear much more likely (84%) than other programs to serve special need children. The most frequently noted special needs served by the responding programs include:

Table 20: Special Needs Served

Emotionally Handicapped (Including Behavioral Disorders)	46%
Physically Handicapped (Including Cerebral Palsy, Autism)	39%
Seeing/Hearing Impaired	24%
Downs Syndrome	21%
Mentally Handicapped/Retarded	17%
Speech/Communication Handicapped	13%
Learning Disabilities	12%

Public schools are more likely to accept physically handicapped children (62%); child care programs are less likely to do so (13%). Public schools are also more likely to serve mentally handicapped children and those with speech problems than other programs, but less likely to serve the hearing impaired or those with Downs Syndrome.

Response to the question of special adaptations made by the program in order to include special needs children in the program indicate that the following adaptations have been made. Staff have received training to increase sensitivity to special needs (31%); staff consult with specialists (18%); building accessibility was improved (7%); specialized equipment was added (7%). 18% of the programs indicate that children must be mainstreamed before they are accepted, and an additional 18% indicate that no special adaptations are made to accommodate these children. Only 8% of the programs feel they are equipped to serve children with major handicaps.

Fees, Costs and Resources

Almost all programs surveyed (129 or 99%) have a fee schedule or parent fees for the program. The average fee for attending an after school program (N=125) 5 days a week is $26.50 a week; the median is $25.00 The range of fees is from $10 a week to $55 a week, a spread of $45 a week. 26% of the programs charge between $10 and $20 a week; 74% charge $30 a week or less; only 26% charge between $31 and $55 a week. The most frequently charged fees are $30 a week (13 programs) and $20 a week (10 programs).

When fees for full-time after school care are examined by program auspices or affiliation, the differences are not significant. The spread between the highest and the lowest mean fee is just under $10 a week. Average fees by program auspices are as follows:

Table 21: Fees by Program Auspices

Auspices	Fee per Week (Five Days After School)
Child Care for-profit (N=19)	$29.11
Child Care Non-profit (N=29)	$25.52
Church/Synagogue (N=16)	$28.81
Public School (N=30)	$25.30
Municipal/Parks and Rec (N=7)	$19.29
Youth Serving Agency (N=18)	$27.56
Other (N=6)	$28.50
Overall Average	$26.52
Range $19.29 - $29.11	

Significant differences ($F=4.7$; $p<0.01$) did appear when fees are compared by degree of urbanicity. Rural fees average $20.08 per week for 5 days of after school care; suburban programs charge $26.53 per week on average; and urban programs charge an average of $27.57 a week.

When urban programs are compared across states, significant differences ($F=5.497$; $p<0.001$) also appear in 5 day a week after school care fees.

Table 22: Average Fees by State Where Program is Located

CA (N=11)	$34.18
Southeast (N=11) (AL, GA, NC, SC, TN)	28.42
FL (N=14)	24.50
IL (N=17)	26.65
MN (N=19)	24.53
NJ (N=17)	26.41
PA (N=6)	23.41
OR (N=6)	17.33
WA (N=13)	34.85
Overall Average	$26.52
Range: $34.85 - 17.33	

While the numbers are very small, it is nonetheless striking that the highest fee (WA) is twice that of the lowest (OR), although it should be remembered that the Oregon programs are mostly rural and thus less expensive than programs located in more urban settings.

100 programs (78%) report that extra fees are charged for the following:

Table 23: Activities Requiring Extra Fees

Registration	79%
Field Trips	40%
Meals/Snacks	20%
Special Activities	18%
Vacations/Holiday Coverage	9%
Late Pick Up	6%

Sliding Fee Scales/Scholarships

Eighty-nine (69%) of the survey programs use a sliding fee schedule or some other form of scholarship assistance for families meeting income guidelines. For-profit child care programs and religiously affiliated programs, are less likely to have scholarship assistance (39% and 38% respectively) and youth serving agency programs are more likely to have this type of support (89%) than other program types. The major sources of scholarship assistance are as follows:

Table 24: Sources of Scholarship Assistance

State Sources (Incl. Title XX)	38%
Other Sources	29%
Tuition and Fees	25%
Municipal Assistance	23%
Private Donations	21%
Charitable Contributions	14%
County Assistance	11%

When these sources of support are analyzed by program auspice the following is noted. Programs under religious auspices are less likely to receive state funds or municipal funds, but more likely to rely on private donations. For-profit child care is less likely to have private donations or municipal assistance, but more likely to have state aid. Youth agencies rely more on municipal assistance, tuition and fees than other programs. Non-profit child care and public schools are more likely to have municipal and county assistance than other programs but less likely to rely on tuition and fees.

Funding Sources

Programs were asked to estimate the percentage of their total operating budgets derived from various funding streams. 124 programs provided some information on the sources of funding support.

Table 25: Funding Sources for Annual Operating Budgets

Source	% Programs
Tuition and Fees	95%
Private Gifts/Grants	35%
State Government	30%
Child Care Food Program	25%
Local Government	25%
Federal Government	11%
In-Kind Donations	9%

The picture which emerges is of programs heavily dependent on tuition and fees. In fact, 69% of the programs report relying on tuition and fees for 75% or more of their budget. Between one-quarter and one-third of survey program budgets are from state and local governments, private gifts, grants, and fund raising, and from the child care food program.

Programs were also asked which local and state agencies or programs provide funding. For local funds, municipal dollars appear to be the most frequent source (35%). For state funds, Title XX was noted by 59% of those programs responding; non-profit child care is more likely (86%) and public schools less likely (25%) to use this source of funds than other programs. Funds from the Dependent Care Block Grant

were only reported by 3% of programs, but another 17% said they received state SACC funds.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, MONITORING, EVALUATIONS, AND ACCREDITATION

Start Up and Technical Assistance

Only 29% (N=36) of programs report technical assistance for start up and program development. Religiously affiliated programs are only half as likely to report technical assistance for start up as other program types. 44% of those getting technical assistance received it from a state or county agency, 14% from a private agency, and 44% from another source.

Monitoring Systems

Ninety-two percent (N=117) of survey programs report that some type of monitoring system is in place for their program. For-profit child care programs are somewhat less likely (79%) than other programs to have such as system. 50% of the programs have internal audits; 41% have external audits; 19% must make periodic reports, but only 6% report periodic inspections. 47% of programs are required to keep specific types of records for monitoring purposes. But religious affiliated programs are less likely (20%) than other programs to be required to keep records.

Sixty-one percent run their monitoring systems internally; 33% of those systems are run by state agencies. 10% or less are run by private agencies, municipal agencies or county agencies. Only 3% of programs receive federal monitoring, which reflects the low level of federal funds (11%) used by these programs.

Rural programs appear to be more likely to be monitored by state agencies and county agencies than urban or suburban programs. Public school affiliated programs are less likely to have an internal monitoring system (44%) and more likely to be monitored by a state agency (56%) than programs under other auspices.

Evaluations

Thirty-six percent (N=46) of the programs surveyed report having received a formal evaluation. The majority of the evaluations were conducted by state agencies (45%) and National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) (23%). Suburban agencies were less likely to be evaluated by state agencies (24%) and more likely to be evaluated by NAEYC (35%) than urban or rural programs. Somewhat unexpectedly, public school affiliated programs report that they are less likely (27%) to be evaluated by state agencies and more likely to receive NAEYC evaluations (43%) than other types of programs.

Accreditation

One hundred and seven (84%) of the survey respondents were aware of NAEYC or other accreditation programs. 37% of respondents intend to or have applied for accreditation; the majority (90%) to NAEYC. Non-profit child care programs are more likely to apply (50%) than other program types. Programs which are licensed appear to be twice as likely to apply for accreditation as those which are exempt from licensure.

THINGS PROGRAMS ARE MOST PROUD OF.....

There were several main subjects brought up in response to this question: staff, program offerings, services to parents, and facilities. Twenty-one programs cited staff as what they were most proud of, and another stated that they were most proud of those parts of the program where capable people were in charge. Three programs mentioned a good rapport between staff and children. A good staff child ratio, a staff that includes college students, and nurturing teachers were cited by one program each.

Nutritious food, outdoor education, a pre-academic component, social development, and a general educational component were mentioned by one program each, as were group gatherings, a weekly theme day, recreational activities, an enrichment program, time for arts and crafts, and a special summer music program. Four mentioned their summer program as a source of pride and two their child development program. More generally, two programs cited that they were always doing new and innovative things; two mentioned the different interest/activity areas they had set up; two noted their curriculum was both interesting and fun; and one mentioned the variety of experiences offered. Six said they were proud of their activities as a whole.

Support from the community was pointed to by two programs, while the relationship with the school and with parents was mentioned by one. The service being provided to the community and parents was mentioned by one program. Two programs said parent participation was what they were proud of, and one said it was the flexibility they offered parents. The special services offered to low-income families was mentioned by one program. Operating year round, providing service to a wide geographic area, and mainstreaming special needs students were cited by one program each. Being located in a public school was mentioned by three programs as a source of pride, while two indicated that they were proud of their facilities and setup.

Having a warm and supportive environment was stressed by three programs, and three others mentioned a caring, nurturing atmosphere. Two point to their concern for each individual child, and two more their sensitivity to the children. Four programs say that children are happy and enjoy coming. One mentions the lasting friendships formed by children; one noted pride in the freedom of choice children had in selecting activities.

More generally, one program was proudest that it had served as a model for other programs in the state; accreditation, recent growth and increases in enrollment

were achievements cited by one program each. One mentioned being proud of the respect it had in the district and the community, one mentioned the quality and continuity of care, and another drew attention to their mission to try and serve all the children who needed the program.

THINGS PROGRAMS WOULD MOST LIKE TO CHANGE

As in the preceding section, staff, activities, and facilities represented three foci of programs' responses to this question. Five programs said they needed more staff in general. One program needed a music specialist in particular, and two were especially in need of experienced school age child care staff. One respondent wanted the regular school staff to be more involved with the after school program, and another said communication between the regular school and the after school program could be better. Two programs wished their staff were full-time; one program wished for less staff turnover and another wanted better quality of staff. Staff also need more training according to one program, while another said their administration could be more efficient and a third that they did not get enough administrative support. Only two programs mentioned that they wanted to increase their staff child ratios.

Five programs mentioned transportation as a problem. Two said they did not have enough vans and drivers, and two wanted transportation so as to make use of community facilities. One program wished they could use public transportation instead of private transportation, and another wanted their transportation arrangements to be more efficient.

Some programs also expressed dissatisfaction with their program offerings. One wanted more enrichment programs for adults. More free play for all children and more unsupervised time for older children were problems mentioned by one program each. Cost effectiveness was cited as a problem with one program's morning program and the program wanted to discontinue the morning session. Another wanted to get rid of one of its part-week program in favor of another full-week program, and a third wanted to make their program run all day. Two programs wanted more offerings for older children and for special needs children, respectively, and one mentioned that they wanted to expose the children to more cultural diversity. Music and dramatics, science, clubs, environmental issues, and a leader-in-training program were all mentioned by one program each as something they wanted to add. Increasing parent participation was cited as a need by one program. Another program would like to become a more integrated part of the public school they are in; and one respondent would like to see a better partnership develop between the public and private sectors of the city.

One program wanted to increase enrollment, and another expressed a problem with transition times. Increased input from the children was mentioned by one program, and more use of community resources by another. One respondent said that her program needed to create a "homier" atmosphere.

The biggest problem with programs' facilities was not having enough space. Space for older children, space in the summer time, space for groups doing different things, and shelf space were all cited by one program each as needed improvements. Four programs just want more space, while two want a better location, two want better facilities, and two want better access to facilities. Guaranteed space is a need expressed by two programs, and three others want increased space in order to increase the number of children served. One program mentioned restrictions in the custodian union contract which prevents them from remaining open on school holidays.

Not unexpectedly, a frequently noted problem was funding. Six programs wanted increased funds so that their staff could earn better salaries, and two wanted funds for staff training; another respondent to hire more staff. Only one program mentioned high rent as a problem. Expanding programming, more activities, better maintenance, and more equipment were cited once each as the reason for needing budget increases. One program indicated that they would use additional funding to make school-age child care more affordable for middle-income families.

CONCLUSIONS

Despite the limited nature of the data provided in this survey, a picture of the provision of school age child care emerges that has significant positive features. Among these is the relative longevity of the programs, the high levels of education required for teachers and directors, and the development of solid program offerings as evidenced by the wide range of activities available. Unexpectedly, programs provided by public schools appear to be equally likely to offer a large range of program activities and to actively involve parents. In fact, public school run programs appear to do better in terms of giving parents real responsibility in program matters than other community based school age child care programs.

Given that the survey of state licensing agencies conducted as part of the larger SACC in America Project by the School-Age Child Care Project found that relatively few states (11 of the 44 reporting) required ratios better than 1:15 for six year olds, the average ratios reported in the survey (1:12.5) are quite impressive.

Yet despite the positive features of the survey programs, the finding that staff still suffer from the general low pay endemic to American child care should give us pause. With 85% of programs reporting staff turnover which on average is 40%, programs are clearly losing many experienced and competent staff who leave the field because of the low salaries and other less than optimal working conditions. There is no question that turnover rates of this magnitude must have a profound effect on the quality of the program offered and on the children who use these programs. Space for school age child care programs is always at a premium. But survey findings that the most frequently used space is located in public school buildings (41%) may indicate a need for communities to be more creative in developing other options, since elementary schools in many parts of the country are facing space shortages due to increased enrollments.

Hopefully, the 1990s will be the decade when America begins to address one of the major issues in all child care, the adequate support of our care givers on whom the entire system rests. As the recent book by the School-Child Care Project recognizes, our children have "No Time To Waste" in waiting for the development of good programs which support their growth and development (Seligson & Fink, 1989).

APPENDIX

Table A-I: Comparison by Program Auspices/Affiliation

Auspices	Average Hourly Wage, Teachers[1] (N=88)	Ratio of Staff to 6 & 7 Yr Olds[2] (N=130)	Average Fee, 5 Days a Week, After School[3] (N=125)
Child Care For-profit	$4.90 (14)	1:13.5 (19)	$29.11
Child Care Non-Profit	6.95 (21)	1:12.5 (29)	25.52
Church/Synagogue	5.78 (14)	1:13.4 (16)	28.81
Public Schools	9.36 (21)	1:13.1 (32)	25.30
Municipal/Parks and Rec	8.32 (4)	1:10.8 (8)	19.29
Youth Serving Agencies	6.16 (9)	1:10.2 (18)	25.56
Other	6.24 (5)	1:13.4 (8)	28.50
Sample Average	$6.95	1:12.5	$26.52

[1] $F = 11.918$; $p < 0.001$

[2] $F = 2.08$; $p < 0.06$

[3] Not Significant.

Table A-II: Comparison by State/Region

State/Region	Average Hourly Wage, Teachers[1] (N=88)	Ratio of Staff to 6 & 7 Yr Olds[2] (N=130)	Average Fee, 5 Days a Week, After School[3] (N=125)
CA	$7.65	1:12.6	$34.18
Southeast[4]	4.45	1:14.6	24.82
FL	4.95	1:14.2	24.50
IL	6.45	1:12.4	26.65
MN	8.10	1:12.8	24.53
NJ	9.51	1:11.4	26.41
PA	6.18	1:10.8	23.41
OR	5.06	1:12.5	17.33
WA	5.98	1:12.4	34.85
Sample Average	$6.95	1:12.5	$26.52

[1] $F = 9.113$; $p < 0.001$

[2] Not Significant.

[3] $F = 5.497$; $p < 0.001$

[4] TN, GA, NC, SC, AL

Table A-III: Comparison by Type of Location

Location	Average Hourly Wage, Teachers[1] (N=81)	Ratio of Staff to 6 & 7 Yr Olds[2] (N=122)	Average Fee, 5 Days a Week, After School[3] (N=117)
Urban	$7.12	1:12.9	$27.57
Suburban	7.24	1:12.3	26.53
Rural	5.97	1:11.3	20.08
Sample Average	$7.06	1:12.4	$26.19

[1]Not Significant.

[2]Not Significant.

[3]$F=4.710$; $p<0.01$

REFERENCES

Association for Children of New Jersey. "Survey on School Aged Child Care Programs", Memo from Ciro A. Scalera, Ex. Dir.. Newark, New Jersey, 1985.

Campbell, Mary. "The Status of School Based Child Care Programs In Washington State", Chapter 4 in Master's Thesis Evergreen State College. Olympia, Washington, 1988.

Commission on Children and Youth. "Child Care in Montgomery County 1984". Montgomery County Government. Rockville, Maryland, 1984.

Fearnside, B., and Cantrell, L. "School-Age Child Care Programs Operated by Florida School Districts: Program Status and Costs, Licensing Desirability and Costs." Prepared for the Florida Department of Education by the School Board of Alachua County, Florida, January, 1988.

Florida House of Representatives, Committee on Education, K-12. "The Status of School-Age Child Care in Florida: An Oversight Report Prepared for the Education K-12 Committee." Florida House of Representatives, Tallahassee, Florida, January, 1985.

Seligson, M., Genser, A., Gannett, E. & Gray, W. "School-Age Child Care: A Policy Report". School-Age Child Care Project Wellesley College Center for Research on Women. Wellesley, Massachusetts, 1983.

Seligson, M., Marx, F. & Feldman, A. "When School is Out in New York City: A Study of Available Resources for School-Age Children When School Is Not In Session". The School Age Child Care Committee. Community Service Society, New York, New York, 1989.

Seligson, M. & Fink, D. "No Time To Waste: An Action Agenda for School-Age Child Care". School-Age Child Care Project Wellesley College Center for Research on Women. Wellesley, Massachusetts, 1989.

Whitebook, M., Howes, C. & Phillips, D., "National Child Care Staffing Study: Executive Summary". Child Care Employee Project. Oakland, California, 1989.